

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Reconsideration and withdrawal of the outstanding grounds of rejection are respectfully requested in light of the above amendments and the remarks which follow.

At the outset, applicant gratefully acknowledges the Examiner's indication that claims 5-7, 9, 10 and 13-15 have been allowed, and that claims 3, 4, 8, 11, 12, 17-22, 24-28 and 36-39 contain allowable subject matter.

By this amendment, applicant has rewritten claims 3 and 4 in independent form, thereby placing these claims in condition for immediate allowance.

The Examiner has rejected claims 1, 2, 16, 23, 29-35 and 40 under 35 U.S.C. 103 as unpatentable over Ball et al. (U.S. 5,890,460) in view of Bernard (U.S. 6,450,133).

According to the Examiner, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify Ball so as to make it trailerable over public roads in view of the teaching of Bernard.

Applicant has amended independent claims 1, 16, 34 and 40 to require that the container that houses the components of the power module is a standard 40 foot ISO shipping container, support for which is found on page 8 of the specification (paragraph 25).

With regard to the references relied upon by the Examiner, Ball discloses in column 2 of the patent, that a center spar of a cover 102 may receive a lifting hook for moving the generator set. It is also stated in column 6 that the generator set 1100 may be mounted on a sled or have a support structure including an opening for tongues of a

forklift, thereby easing transportation and positioning of the generator set. The enclosure in Bernard is specified as a "twelve meters ISO high cube container." Both Ball and Bernard disclose generator sets incorporating a diesel engine (not a gaseous-fuel engine).

One of the significant aspects of the present invention is the ability to have a gaseous-fuel engine and all related cooling components housed within a standard 40 foot ISO container. Neither reference is concerned with, and neither reference discloses or suggests any way in which this may be done. In this regard, the fact that Ball discloses that its generator sets may be movable by forklift is not at all a teaching that a generator set with a gaseous-fuel engine may be enclosed within a standard 40 foot ISO shipping container. Similarly, regardless of what the dimensions may be of Bernard's container, there is no teaching in that reference that a gaseous-fuel engine and associated cooling components can be effectively enclosed in the required container. The Examiner's assertion that the size of the container is merely an engineering design choice is clearly improper since the specific arrangement of component parts as required by the claims make it possible to solve a particular and significant problem that is clearly set out in the specification, particularly pages 1-4.


It is therefore respectfully submitted that independent claims 1, 16, 34 and 40, as well as rejected dependent claims 23, 31-33 and 35 are clearly patentable over the applied prior art. In light of the above amendments, dependent claims 2, 29 and 30 have been cancelled.

CAMPION
Appl. No. 10/001,908
September 29, 2004

Since all of the remaining application claims 1, 3-28 and 31-40 are now in condition for immediate allowance, early passage to issue is requested. In the event, however, any small matters remain outstanding, the Examiner is encouraged to telephone the undersigned so that the prosecution of this application can be expeditiously concluded.

Respectfully submitted,

NIXON & VANDERHYE P.C.

By: 
Michael J. Keenan
Reg. No. 32,106

MJK:ljb
1100 North Glebe Road, 8th Floor
Arlington, VA 22201-4714
Telephone: (703) 816-4000
Facsimile: (703) 816-4100